

REMARKS

Claims 20-49 are now pending in the application. Of these pending claims, Claims 20-33, 35, 37, and 45 have been cancelled herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 22 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have cancelled these claims.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 & § 103

Claims 20, 21, 24, 25, 34, 35, 39, 40, 43, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shoup, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,074,103). Claims 20, 22, 34-36, 39, 40, 43 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by either one of Hughs, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,825,717) or Wenrich et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,696,227).

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoup, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,074,103) taken with the British document no. GB2065011A, cited by Applicant. Claims 23, 41, and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of Shoup, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,074, 103), Hughs, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,825,717), or Wenrich, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,696,227) as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Sneddon, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 2,782,451). Claims 27-33, 42, 46, 48, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

as being unpatentable over any one of Shoup, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,074,103), Hughs, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,825,717), or Wenrich, et al. (3,696,227) and further in view of Krengel, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,762,392). Claims 37 and 38 are objected to for depending from rejected claims, but would be given favorable consideration if recast in independent form to include all of the limitation of the parent claims.

The Examiner's attention is directed to independent Claim 34 which has been amended to include the limitations of allowable Claim 37. Claim 38 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of the parent claims.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12-14-2004

By: 

Christopher A. Eusebi
Reg. No. 44,672

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

CAE/smb